REMARKS

Telephone conference

On February 13, 2008 and on January 24, 2008 a telephone interview was conducted between Examiner Sheikh, Supervisory Patent Examiner Ryan Zender, Varda Treibach-Heck, and David Lewis.

The Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sheikh and Supervisory Patent Examiner Ryan Zeender for both telephone conferences.

During the interview of January 24, 2007, the Examiner requested that the Applicants explain how the claims are distinct from Column 8, lines 17-32*, Column 13, lines 28-43**, Column 14 lines 4-25*** and 48-55**** and Server 116***** of Johnson et al. In addition to the arguments presented in the attachment to the request for the interview filed on January 17, 2008, the Applicant was instructed to explain the reason that reference does not teach the claim limitations cited in the comparison table.

During the interview of January 24, 2008, the Examiner agreed to accept the definitions given in the argument unless further searching shows them to be problematic. If the definitions are found to be problematic, the Examiners agreed to cite definitions published no later than the October 31, 2001, the patent application filing date, but preferably published at the time of the prior art cited.

During the interview of February 13, 2008, after considering the arguments below, the Examiner was favorably disposed towards allowing the application. However, the Examiner felt that he needed to conduct a new search upon receiving a response and therefore could not commit to allowing the application. During the interview the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 6, 2008 was briefly mentioned.

Pending claims

Claims 1, 3, and 6 are pending. Claim 1 is independent. Although the Applicants propose no amendment to any of the claims, the Applicants are open to suggestions.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

United States Patent No. 5,664,109, Johnson et al

All of the pending claims stand rejected as being obvious in view of a hypothetical combination of the teachings of Johnson et al. in view of Tran. After the Notice of Allowability in March 2006, Applicants cancelled several dependant claims and combined them to form a large independent claim 1. Claim 1 has many parts to it. Applicants will show that neither Johnson nor Tran disclose, teach, or suggest a device containing all of these elements either singularly or combined.

In the discussion below, claim 1 is divided into 9 parts for ease of discussion. Passages of Johnson that the Examiner requested be discussed are noted with asterisks: Column 8, lines 17-32* (Claim 1, Part 4) , Column 13, lines 28-43**(Claim 1, Part 5), Column 14 lines 4-25***(Claim 1, Part 8) and 48-55****(Claim 1, Part 7) and Server 116***** (Claim 1, Part 2 ,3, 5 and 9).

Claim 1, Part 1, begins, **"A data collection and reporting method comprising, in a central computer system,"** (emphasis added). In other words, claim 1 requires a **"central computer system."** Yet, in regards to FIG 1, Johnson states at column 6, lines 35-38, state,

> A plurality of local network workstations 126 used for server operations are segregated from the server backplane using switching hub 124 to increase the bandwidth of the backplane.

In other words, server operations are performed by "work stations" that are "segregated" from one another. Since the "workstations" (of column 6, lines 35-38) are "segregated" and presumably manned by human operators, Johnson is able to show the ability of functions to operate independently and in a **decentralized** manner. Thus, Johnson is not a central computer system but rather asynchronous, disparate operations.

Also Col 6, lines 51-53, state,

> The scanning and recognition processes can be performed off-site, using commercially available equipment and programs.

Conclusion: since the recognition can be performed off-site, Johnson is not a method comprising a central computer system.

The Applicants acknowledge that Tran is a method comprising a central computer system. However, Tran has limitations that preclude Tran's device from functioning as described in claim 1. These limitations are discussed in the other eight parts to claim 1.

Claim 1 next recites three processing steps, (which are labeled i, ii, iii) which are all performed automatically, without human intervention, starting from the first step listed ending with the last step listed.

Claim 1, Part 2 recites a first processing step.

> automatically, that is, *independent of any required human intervention*:
> i) *receiving, directly from a device* for converting a physical form into a transmittable, electronic representation of the physical form, *over a transmission channel*, the electronic representation of the physical form,....

Step "i" requires automatically receiving without human intervention "over a transmission channel" an electronic representation of a physical form from a device for converting an initial "physical form" (e.g., a hardcopy). Johnson's Figure 2 as well as its specifications confirm that Johnson is unable to do this because a fax must be manually scanned after it is received over a transmission channel as evidenced in Column 6, lines 44-55, which state (emphasis added):

> The data repository engine 200 receives hardcopy or softcopy reports from medical service providers. *Hardcopies* of medical reports are sent by mail or *transmitted by facsimile and are scanned by a document scanning process 202* to create a file containing the optical image of the document. Text in the optical image is then read by an optical character recognition process 204 to create a file, referred to herein as an "OCR file". The optical image file and the OCR file are then **delivered on media** or electronically transmitted to a server computer 116*****.

In the first sentence of the above paragraph, if the report is initially a softcopy, then there is no disclosure of the softcopy resulting from a physical form or being received from a device that converts a physical form into the softcopy. Presumably the softcopy was created on a PC by filling in an electronic form. If the report (that was received at data repository 200) is a hardcopy, the hardcopy is *"scanned by a document scanning process...."* The fact that the facsimile needs to be scanned implies that the facsimile is received as a second hard copy (which is a degraded version of the original hardcopy that was converted into the facsimile for transmission) and the second hardcopy is placed in a scanner. Therefore, the image of the hardcopy that is analyzed is *not* the directly received "electronic representation of the physical form" (recited in claim 1) at

all, but rather an image created in an additional, intermediate, _manual_ processing step, namely scanning. In summary, on the one hand the softcopy received at the data repository never had a physical form and if there is a physical form, the hard copy requires a _manual_ processing step, scanning. Additionally Johnson's Report Handler 208 receives documents after the OCR process 204 **and not through a transmission channel.**

Tran describes a system that does not use a transmission channel or an electronic representation of a physical form but rather an Input/Output device that is directly connected to and controlled by a user's individual data entry. Specifically, column 5 lines 17-18, state

> The assembly combination of the digitizer 25 and the LCD panel 26 serves as an input/output device.

In other words, Tran has an input output device for manual entry of data. Also, column 5, lines 30-31, state,

> This embodiment accepts pen strokes from the user using a stylus or pen which is positioned over a digitizer.

Thus, Tran uses a stylus for receiving human input.

Further, column 12, lines 26-35, state,

> During operation, when the **user writes** a shorthand code, the description requested in step 254 is substituted in place of the abbreviation **during the generation of reports**, thus providing a quick and convenient mechanism to enter repetitive phrases. In addition to speeding **the user's data entry** and minimizing typographical errors, the use of abbreviated codes also reduces the data storage requirement of the work description.

In other words, Tran, at column 12, lines 26-35, states that the user enters data in a shorthand code and then generates reports from data entry, which is a form of human intervention and is NOT "_receiving, directly from a device for converting a physical form into a transmittable, electronic representation of the physical form._"

The motivation behind Tran's device is to replace "time logs" manually "recorded on blank sheets of paper," because they are "inaccurate" (column 1, lines 29-34, also see column 1, lines 39-45 and column 2, lines 8-11, which further describe the disadvantages of recording time by paper and pen). Thus if one of ordinary skill in the art would have followed the teachings of Tran, Tran would have been used to eliminate any hardcopy option from Johnson et al., while in contrast, claim 1 recites that the receiving is "from a device for converting a physical form into a

transmittable, electronic representation of the physical form." Thus, were Johnson et al. combined with Tran, the "physical form" of claim 1 and therefore the device for converting the physical form would also not have been present, and consequently the combination of Johnson et al. and Tran would not have resulted in the automated processing recited in claim 1. As replacing paper with computer data entry to eliminate hard copy is a central point of Tran, it cannot be ignored, because Tran must be read "as a whole." **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran whether taken separately or in combination use the method described in Claim 1, Part 2.**

Claim 1, Part 3 recites a second processing step

automatically, that is, independent of any required human intervention:...
ii) identifying the location of the data fields in the received electronic representation of the form;

Figure 2, process 212 illustrates "batch processing," in which (according to the Wikipedia definition) *"all input data is pre-selected. This normally involves the operator selecting the documents ... and indicating to the batch"*. Therefore Johnson's batch processing system precludes "independent of any required human intervention," because according to the definition of batch processing an operator must select documents that fit the batch rules for identifying the location and the meaning of data fields on the form.

Additionally, Johnson does not work with the invention's concept of data fields at all, because the claimed data fields are within an electronic representation of the "form," which is the "physical form" recited in step "i." Johnson discloses (column 6, lines 55-62) some means of handling structured data such as database tables or formatted disk files as long as these are *"delivered on machine readable media, such as magnetic or optical tape or disk, or transmitted electronically to the server computer 116*****",* which is a delivery mechanism that is unrelated to the subject of claim 1 because (as explained above) it is NOT *the transmittable, electronic representation of the physical form of step ",i"* which is referenced as "the form" in step "*ii,*" but simply structured electronic data.

Tran describes a system that requires human intervention and data entry, and does not work with an *electronic representation of the form.* For example, column 5, lines 9-11, state,

> The computer system of the present invention receives instructions **from the user** via one or more switches such as push-button switches 24.

Also, column 9, lines 65-67, state,

> the present invention accumulates information via data-entry screens that are intuitive and easy to understand to help the user capture information quickly and efficiently.

In other words, users manually provide instructions with switches or data entry screens and consequently, Tran works at the data-entry level and not with electronic images of physical forms containing data. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1, Part 3.**

Claim 1, Part 4 recites a third processing step:

> *automatically, that is, independent of any required human intervention: ...*
> *iii) both extracting report data from the report and storing the extracted report data in a predetermined common format in a memory for subsequent processing;*

Johnson, FIGS 2 & 3, illustrate that the automated data extraction process has known problems that are solved with architected human intervention, as column 2, line 60, state,

> Fuzzy links may be established between a medical document and a master patient record when the degree of confidence in the match is not high. These fuzzy links then may be **subsequently reviewed for resolution by human judgment** or additional matching processes.

In other words, Johnson architects a procedure for instances when it rates its data extraction process as possibly inaccurate and, subsequently builds an interface for review and resolution by **human judgment** or additional human triggered matching processes.

Also, column 8, lines 17-31*, state,

> If the batch extraction process 212 encounters a document for which it cannot extract the necessary information, the document handle is forwarded to the *interactive extraction process* 214 as an anomalous document. As indicated at 312, the interactive extraction process 214 involves retrieving the ASCII text file from the document repository process 210 by presenting the document handle to the document management process 304. **A human interpreter views** the document and interacts with the manage knowledge base process 308. Rules are provided from the knowledge base 218 to the interactive extraction process 312. **The human interpreter manually resolves and augments any unresolved extraction operation.** If the document is a new type of document, **additional extraction rules can be added to the knowledge base 218 for future processing.**

In other words, Johnson et al. has an interactive extraction process 214, which is used so that a human can intervene and interactively extract the data not extracted automatically **whereas claim 1, step iii, requires that there is no required human intervention during the extraction.** Additionally, column 10, lines 59-63, further state,

> The **interactive extraction processing** may be **completely manual or semi-automatic,** by automatically extracting certain data values, while pausing and prompting **the operator to resolve or validate application of other rules that it cannot otherwise execute.**

In other words, the interactive extraction process is either "**completely manual or semi-automatic,**" but is not completely automatic.

Furthermore, regarding FIG. 6, col. 12, lines 25-27, state,

> The **quality assurance process provides a user interface** and extraction, query and association capabilities required for the specialist to resolve the anomaly.

Johnson architected yet another procedure for resolving anomalies which presumably resulted from the automated portion of the extraction. Finally, FIG 4, Step 418, and FIG. 7 illustrate that the data extraction values are not used for *storing the extracted report data in a predetermined common format in a memory for subsequent processing*; but rather the report data is used as an index for file retrieval. Col. 12 Lines 62-67, state,

> Referring now to FIG. 7, there is illustrated the structure of tables of data stored by the server network 112 (FIG. 1) in the database 216 (FIG. 2). **These database tables enable inquiry and retrieval by subscribers to the system of basic patient and document information, as well as retrieval of documents linked to the patients.**

As established in Claim 1 Part 2, Tran does not work with the electronic representation of the physical form. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1, Part 4.**

Art Unit 3627

Page 8 of 20

Docket: Call-Tell MP

boilerplate
PAGE 10/22 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 9:18:22 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-4/21 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):08-38

Claim 1, Part 5 recites a fourth processing requirement:

> *for at least one third party, storing a set of party-specific rules in the memory;*
> *associating the received report with the corresponding third party; and*
> *associating at least one fourth party with the sender and with at least one of the*
> third parties;
> *in which:*
> > *the third party is an agency that communicates with the central computer*
> system using an agency computer system.
> > *the fourth party is a client of the agency and communicates with the*
> central computer system using a client computer system, the agency and client being
> contractually related entities;*

In order to determine if Johnson functions identically to claim 1, we must first define the different parties. Johnson states the role of two interactive parties in its Abstract, **the host,** the managed health care organization and **the senders**, medical service providers (emphasis added),

> A central medical record repository **for a managed health care organization** accepts and stores medical record documents in any format **from medical service providers.**

The medical service providers, the senders, are defined as also being subscribers as well as clients, and further as physicians, clinics, hospitals, laboratories, insurance companies, researchers or other persons or entities requiring access to the records as shown in Column 4, lines 41-51,

> Referring to FIG. 1 there is schematically illustrated a centralized, computer-based system 110 for receiving, storing and processing records for subsequent access by **subscribing service providers such as physicians, clinics, hospitals, laboratories, insurance companies, researchers or other persons or entities requiring access to the records.** The System 110 includes at least one network of server computers 112 organized as a local area network for serving **a plurality of subscriber client systems 114 belonging to medical service providers. Client systems 114 can be stand-alone computers or networks of computers.**

The patient is another party whose data is included in the central computer system but who does not directly interact with the central computer system as discussed in Column 13, lines 28-43**,

> Medical record link table 708 lists links between each patient, as identified by a master patient identifier, and each medical record number that has been assigned by a subscribing provider to the patient. The master patient identifier associates each record in the table to a record in master patient record table 702. The medical record link table 708

thus serves as a list of all medical record numbers assigned to a particular patient that facilitates the linking of a document to a patient using a medical record number as described in connection with MPI Populator process of FIG. 6. A record is created for each new medical record number which is extracted from a document that has otherwise been matched to the patient or which has been otherwise associated to the patient. The provider or subscriber which assigned the medical record number is also listed in a separate field in the link record.

In claim 1, Applicants' invention defines the central system as the 1st party, the sender as the 2nd party, the agency as the 3rd party and the agency's client as the 4th party. Let's look at Johnson's discussion of roles and see if they can be directly applied to the definitions used in Claim 1. Johnson discusses only three roles: managed heath care organization (central system), medical service providers (senders) and patients (clients of both the health care organization as well as the service providers), and therefore Johnson, with three parties, cannot disclose the invention of claim 1, which has 4 parties.

Additionally, the central system is a medical record repository for a managed health care organization; in other words the central system plays the agency role or third party role; displaying that the system is missing a first party, the system itself, thus Johnson does not contain the following element *the third party is an agency that communicates with the central computer system using an agency computer system.* Additionally, as the senders are identified in the Abstract as the medical service providers (2nd party), the 4th party, therefore, must be the patient. Johnson states that access is provided for the second party to the central system, but does not show in the Figures or discuss in the text central system access for a fourth party, the patient who according to Claim 1 communicates *with the central computer system using a client computer system.*

Whether or not computer server 116 receives a transmission from the scanner, (which is apparently alleged to be the "device for converting a physical form into a transmittable, electronic representation of the physical form"), there is no third party or fourth party associated with computer server 116*****.

A text search in Tran produces no results for the term "party", "rules", "third", "fourth" or "agency". Tran relates to a computer system for recording time and expense associated with a service provider and does not discuss multi-party access. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the following methods described in Claim 1, Part 5: "*the third party is an agency that communicates with the central computer system using an agency computer system; the*

Serial No. 10/003,341   Docket: Call-Tell MP
Art Unit 3627   Page 10 of 20

PAGE 12/22 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 9:18:22 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-4/21 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):08-38

fourth party is a client of the agency and communicates with the central computer system using a client computer system, the agency and client being contractually related entities."

Claim 1, Part 6 recites a fifth processing requirement:

the sender is a person referred by the agency to the client and performs work tasks for the client;
the at least one parameter includes time worked by the sender on behalf of the client;

In claim 1, Applicants' invention defines the central system as the 1st party, the sender as the 2nd party, the agency as the 3rd party and the agency's client as the 4th party. Previously, it was shown that the agency was the managed health care organization. Johnson discusses the sender as being medical service providers and the record keeping it maintains as being patient services.

Column 2, lines 38-42, state

> In one embodiment of the invention, medical service providers send or transmit documents containing medical record information of a patient to a central data processing system.

Also, column 1, lines 19-22, state,

> Each medical service provider typically maintains medical records for services the provider renders for a patient, but rarely if ever has medical records generated by other providers.

Therefore if the Applicants' invention and Johnson were equivalent, the sender would need to be a provider that performs work tasks for the patient and reports on time spent for the patient on behalf of the managed health care organization. However, Johnson states that health care providers report on services not time. Additionally a text search on "time" indicates that the only time reported is "origination date/time" which is not *"at least one parameter includes time worked by the sender on behalf of the client"* as recited in claim 1.

A text search in Tran produces no results for the term "sender". This invention relates to a user operated computer system for directly recording time and expenses. Thus, following the teachings of Johnson et al. in view of Tran, the doctors may have recorded their time using Tran's device, but would not have sent that information to Johnson et al, because the doctors invoice the managed health care organizations for patient services regardless of time spent on

Serial No. 10/003,341
Art Unit 3627   Page 11 of 20   Docket: Call-Tell MP

PAGE 13/22 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 9:18:22 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-4/21 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):08-38

procedures. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1,**
Part 6.

Claim 1, Part 7 recites a sixth processing requirement:

> *via a publicly accessible transmission network, receiving access requests from the agency and the client sent through their respective computer systems for portions of the extracted report data defined according to the respective party-specific rules, and responding to the access requests by **returning the requested report data to the agency and client**, respectively, including automatically, that is, independent of any required human intervention, **completing any requests for interactive and iterative review, modification or annotation**, inclusive, of the report data by the agency and client according to each party's respective party-specific rules, **whereby the central computer system is an intermediary system between the sender on the one hand and the agency and client on the other hand and exposes different interfaces to the sender, agency and client;***

In other words, the center gives access to the agency about the data collected from the sender, from the client, and from the agency's users. Upon receiving a user-specific request for data, automatically and without human intervention, the report is returned for viewing according to user specified rules.

Previously, it was established that the agency (3rd party) in Johnson is the managed health care organization and that the senders are medical service providers/subscribers/client system 114 (2nd party), thus identifying the fourth party, the client, as the patient. It was also established that Johnson has no drawings or discussions whereby the patient, via a computer system, accesses the medical record repository, therefore Johnson has no drawings or discussions whereby the system returns reports to the patient (client) or receives reviews, modifications or annotations from the patient (client) or exposes a different interface to the patient (client).

Column 4, lines 47-50,

> System 110 includes at least one network of server computers 112 organized as a local area network for serving a plurality of subscriber client systems 114 belonging to medical service providers. Client systems 114 can be stand-alone computers or networks of computers.

Column 14, lines 48-55****

> At step 805, the query is presented to the master patient index database for matching to a patient record using master patient records table 702 (FIG. 7). If a patient match is found, identifying information on the documents linked to the patient in longitudinal link table 710 is retrieved from the document identifier database 216 (FIG. 2). This information is then, at step 808, formatted and transmitted to the client system 114.

When Johnson uses the term "client system" the system is not the same client as defined by the claims, but rather as noted in **Description of the Drawings,** the medical service providers. Thus, in step 805, the medical service provider (2nd party) is presenting a query to the managed heath care organization's record repository (3rd party) about a patient (4th party) and receiving patient data back in its own system (2nd party). It is not *completing any requests for interactive and iterative review, modification or annotation* or "*returning the requested report data to the agency*(3rd party) *and client* (4th party)," or acting as *an intermediary system between the sender on the one hand and the agency and client on the other hand and exposing different interfaces to the sender, agency and client* as required in part 7 of claim 1.

Tran relates to a computer system for recording time and expense associated by a service provider and does not discuss multi-party access, and therefore does not cure the deficiency of Johnson et al. of not teaching the features described earlier. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1, Part 7.**

Claim 1, Part 8 recites a seventh processing requirement:

> *converting the extracted report data into a format specified by the rules associated with that third party, whereby* **third parties operating different hardware platforms and processing software may receive and process extracted report data from the same memory within the central computer system;**

The processing requirement above discusses a relationship between the central computer system (1st party) and the agency (3rd party). In the earlier discussion of Claim 1, Part 5, it was established in Johnson that the central computer system and the agency, the managed health care organization are not two separate entities as defined in the applicants' claim 1, but rather a single entity.

The text below, referred by the Examiner, demonstrates functionality that reads like Part 8 but actually takes place between the agency (3rd party) and the sender/subscriber (2nd party). Column 14, lines 4-25*** state,

> Another database stores information relating to access and use of the system by subscribers. In table 716, each authorized subscriber has a record which includes the subscriber's name, log on identification, and other basic information such as address, role (such as "primary care physician") and telephone numbers. Additionally, each record contains a field for an E-mail address and the identifier of the user's usual node in order for the system or another subscriber to communicate with the subscriber. The record also contains a privileges mask and the user's role for use in supporting system security.

Serial No. 10/003,341   Docket: Call-Tell MP
Art Unit 3627   Page 14 of 20

PAGE 16/22 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 9:18:22 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-4/21 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):08-38

Information on each subscriber node such as client system 114 within the computer-based system 110 is stored in a separate record in table 718. This information includes an unique node identifier assigned by the network which associates the node with a user in user information table 716, node name and type, and the nodes physical location and network location. Additionally, the display capabilities of the subscriber's equipment of the node is indicated so that documents are sent in a version and format that can be displayed. Additionally, the record keeps track of the privilege level of the node and the log on identification of the usual user of the node for security purposes.

This paragraph discusses that the system differentiates its subscribers/users (2nd party) as well as the capabilities of the subscriber's (2nd party) equipment. The above passage does not discuss how *"third parties operating different hardware platforms and processing software may receive and process extracted report data from the same memory within the central computer system"*. As we previously established, Johnson does not separate its third party from its central computer system.

Tran relates to a computer system for recording time and expense associated by a service provider and does not discuss multi-party access. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1, Part 8.**

Claim 1, Part 9 recites an eighth and final processing requirement:

> *transferring a copy of the extracted report data to the third party via the network, whereby the transferred data resides at and is available for processing by the third party.*

Previously it was shown that the third party is the managed health care organization and the senders are subscribers/medical service providers (2nd party). Johnson discusses using extracted data for further processing, but, the extracted data is used by the 2nd party not the 3rd.

Column 3, lines 32-43, state,

> Briefly, the data repository engine receives a medical record report or document from a subscribing medical provider and extracts values for pre-defined data items from the record. It catalogs the data and stores each medical record report or document as a data file in a repository for subsequent retrieval by subscribers or further processing. Various application programs 220 which are described in connection with other figures, make use of the extracted data. The processes of the data repository engine 200 are executed by the server computers 116***** either sequentially or simultaneously, depending on demand for the process and available processing capacity of the servers.

The data repository accessed by server computers 116 receives reports from the medical providers (e.g., the senders), and then extract and record information for retrieval by the medical

service providers. Since the medical service providers are the senders (the second party of claim 1), then the medical service providers cannot also be the third party of claim 1.

Tran relates to a computer system for recording time and expense associated by a service provider and does not discuss multi-party access, and consequently does not cure the deficiency of Johnson et al. not disclosing *"transferring a copy of the extracted report data to the third party via the network, whereby the transferred data resides at and is available for processing by the third party."*

. **Conclusion: Neither Johnson nor Tran use the method described in Claim 1, Part 9.**

Summary

Claim 1	Johnson	Tran
Part 1	No	Yes
Part 2	No	No
Part 3	No	No
Part 4	No	No
Part 5	No	No
Part 6	No	No
Part 7	No	No
Part 8	No	No
Part 9	No	No

There are at least eight significant claimed distinguishing features that differentiate the claims from the prior art, and which make applicants' invention much easier and more versatile to use in contexts such as multiple parties sharing the reporting of worked time. Applicants' invention is focused on automatically collecting data from remote senders submitting reports via a transmission channel that are received without human intervention in a central computer system. Johnson et al. receive reports as a hard copy or facsimile which are then scanned at the center and batched at workstations. Tran does not receive reports, but rather creates them as output from a user's data entry.

The Applicants' central computer system automatically identifies and extracts data from the electronic representation of the form and converts it for storage and subsequent processing or review. Johnson's center system employs a scanning system and work stations to integrate received hard copy and facsimile forms and media files. Johnson's center system employs operators for pre batch processing, reviewing "fuzzy links", interactive extraction and interpretation, and quality assurance. Tran's system collects data directly from a user so the methods are not applicable to Applicants' invention.

The Applicants describe a four party system: central computer as an intermediary, sender, agency and client of the agency. The Applicants' invention provides three separate interfaces for the sender, agency and client and allows the sender to report time; other parties, upon proper authentication can annotate received data and indicate acceptance or rejection of the reported data. Neither Johnson nor Tran provide any of these functions.

Finally, the applicants' invention converts extracted data into a format specified by agency rules and transfers that data to the agency for further processing. Johnson uses subscriber/sender rules to extract data for further processing by the subscriber. Tran does not work with multi-parties.

For the above reasons, the pending claims are allowable.

It is the Applicants' understanding that all fees have been paid and that if an extension of time is necessary it has been requested. However, if that is incorrect, if an extension of time is necessary, an extension of time to at least the current date is hereby requested. The fee for the extension of time and any fees may be billed to the above account number, if (1) there is not a check enclosed that already covers the extension of time and/or the other fees, or (2) if a check was enclosed, but is insufficient to cover the extension of time and/or any other fees that may be due. Please charge any fees or any deficiency of fees that may be due (and that have not already been paid for in full here or elsewhere) to Deposit Account # 503345.

Please feel free to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at 408-993-1800.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Lewis

Feb 13, 2008

Date

Registration Number 33,101
1250 Aviation Avenue, Suite 200B
San Jose, California 95110
Fax Number 408-993-1800

Terms and Definitions

Workstations

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_station

as a high-end desktop or desk side microcomputer designed for technical applications. Workstations are intended primarily to be used by one person at a time, although they can usually also be accessed remotely by other users when necessary.

Batch Processing

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Batch_processing states,

Batch jobs are set up so they can be run to completion without human interaction, so all input data is preselected. This normally involves the operator selecting the documents ... and indicating to the batch... software when and where they should be output. Batch processing is also used for automated transaction processing, as contrasted to interactive online transaction processing (OLTP) applications.

http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/B/batch_processing.html

The opposite of batch processing is transaction processing or interactive processing. In interactive processing, the application responds to commands as soon as you enter them.

Scanning

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image_scanner

"In computing, a scanner is a device that analyzes images, printed text, or handwriting and converts it to a digital image....While paper feeding and scanning can be done automatically and quickly, preparation and indexing are necessary and require much work by humans. Preparation involves manually inspecting the papers to be scanned and making sure that they are in order, unfolded, without staples or anything else that might jam the scanner....

"Indexing involves associating keywords to files so that they can be retrieved by Indexing involves associating keywords to files so that they can be retrieved by content. This process can sometimes be automated to some extent, but is likely to involve manual labour. One common practice is the use of barcode-recognition technology: during preparation, barcode sheets with folder names are inserted into the document files, folders, and document groups. Using automatic batch scanning, the documents are saved into the appropriate folders, and an index is created for integration into document-management software systems."

Serial No. 10/003,341
Art Unit 3627

Page 19 of 20

Docket: Call-Tell MP

PAGE 21/22 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 9:18:22 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-4/21 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):08-38

Scanner
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image_scanner

        Scanning the document is only one part of the process. For the scanned image to be useful, it must be transferred from the scanner to an application running on the computer. There are two basic issues: (1) how the scanner is physically connected to the computer and (2) how the application retrieves the information from the scanner. In practice, there are often problems with an application communicating with a scanner. Either the application or the scanner manufacturer (or both) may have faults in their implementation of the API. Each scanner manufacturer provides software that translates the API procedure calls into primitive commands that are issued to a hardware controller (such as the SCSI, USB, or FireWire controller).